

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at University of Redlands

Professional Services Division

April 24, 2002

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at the University of Redlands. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendations

1. The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for the University of Redlands and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

- The institution must provide a well defined written plan for hiring and retaining faculty that reflect cultural, ethnic and gender diversity. The plan must indicate how the various levels (President, Academic Vice President, School of Education Dean, etc.) of the university will be involved.
- The institution must provide evidence that it has developed and implemented a systematic, comprehensive and formalized plan for evaluating the quality of its courses and field experiences. The plan must involve diverse community members (e.g., program participants, graduates, local practitioners, participating schools and school districts) in the collection of evaluative information and data and indicate how the information is being used for program design, development and improvement.
- The institution must provide evidence that it develops and implements an individual plan for the mentoring support and professional development of each intern in the Basic Credential program in consultation with the intern and the employing school district.
- The institution must provide evidence that the Multiple Subject coursework begins to prepare each candidate to plan and deliver content-specific instruction in mathematics, science, history-social science, the visual and performing arts, physical education, and

health. The coursework as described in the proposed syllabi must include instruction and class experiences addressing specific pedagogical content knowledge.

- The institution must provide evidence that Multiple and Single Subject candidates learn to evaluate current educational technologies and materials, to appropriately select software, to effectively assess electronic research tools including web sites, and to analyze best practices and research findings on the use of technology.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
 - Preliminary
 - Preliminary Internship
 - Professional
- Multiple Subject Credential
- Single Subject Credential
- Multiple Subject Internship Credential
- Single Subject Internship Credential
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
 - School Counseling
- Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential:
 - Language Speech and Hearing
 - Special Class Authorization

(2) The team recommends that the University of Redlands provide written evidence to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing staff that appropriate actions have been taken to remove each of these stipulations and address all standards that are less than fully met and that the team leader and a team member revisit the university to verify the appropriate action in relation to all stipulations and standards less than fully met within one year from the date of this action.

(3) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- The University of Redlands be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- The University of Redlands be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2007-2008 academic year.

Background Information

Located in Redlands, California, the University of Redlands is an independent, coeducational, liberal arts and sciences university of 4,000 students. Approximately 350 students are enrolled in one of the credential programs offered at the university. The teacher preparation program represents over 200 of the current credential student body while the other 150 are enrolled in the other credential programs, including programs in Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services, Pupil Personnel Services with a specialization in School Counseling and Clinical Rehabilitative Services: Language Speech and Hearing – Special Class Authorization.

A decision was made in the spring of 2000 to reorganize the then-Whitehead College of Life-long learning into two separate professional schools: a school of business and a school of education. This resulted in a number of organizational changes for the university including a national search for a new dean of education (hired in the summer of 2001) and the initiation of searches for several faculty lines that were vacant and/or occupied by temporary or part-time faculty. Internal structures for the new School of Education were developed and then finalized by the new dean when he took office. These included, among other things, three Directors of programs. Two new positions, Director of Administration and Enrollment Services, established at the time of the school's organization, and a new Director of Educational Technology have also been appointed.

The School of Education moved from its former location in Larsen Hall in August 2001. The School faculty and staff are now located in the recently renovated University Hall North and has seven classrooms reserved for its primary use in that building. The classroom space includes a technology classroom equipped with sixteen PC computer workstations, and equipment for projecting various audio-visual formats. In addition, there are two “smart” classrooms and two “smart” seminar rooms that are wired for the use of interactive technology. Classrooms in Gregory Hall (the new science building) and the Hall of Letters are assigned to Education classes each term as needed. In addition to classroom space, the renovated School of Education building has assigned faculty, administrative, and staff offices, an Instructional Resource Center, a Library Conference Room, instructor preparation rooms, and a lounge for students, staff and faculty. The extensive access to technology allows faculty to use on-line resources and have students conduct on-line research in class.

The School has sixteen full-time faculty positions. The School's full-time faculty represents a broad range of expertise, with particular strengths in second language acquisition, classroom management, and multicultural education. Currently, seven full-time faculty positions are held by visiting faculty or are vacant. The School is conducting searches to fill the seven positions with tenure-track faculty who will start in the fall 2003 term.

Additionally, the School decided to become an “early adopter” of SB 2042 standards which, while serving important purposes, nevertheless placed the team in the position of needing to make judgements about the educational quality of the Basic Credential program while the School of Education was in the midst of transitioning from their old program to the new one.

Founded in 1907 by American Baptists, Redlands maintains an informal association with that denomination. The university boasts about being inclusive, indicating that they value the diversity of their faculty, staff, student body, and trustees. As the first catalog declared in

1909, *"The University of Redlands will avoid sectarianism and narrowness in its teachings and policy. It is a school to which anyone may come for college training without having his denominational preference interfered with in the least. Its aim is to educate the heart as well as the head, and to develop the student physically, intellectually, and morally."*

The university defines itself as a community of scholars and encourages a value-centered education by challenging assumptions and stressing moral concerns in both classes and activities. A commitment to liberal education forms the foundation of the University's programs. The university states that skills and values developed in this context not only support specific disciplines but also promote professional flexibility and personal growth.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the institution in Spring 2000 and met with institutional leadership initially at that time. Over the next two years, there were numerous consultant staff meetings with faculty, program directors and institutional administration. The meetings led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical details and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. In May of 2000, the consultant met with the institutional contact person to develop a strategy for the review of the multi-site locations and consider the size of the team. The team size agreement was developed in June 2000. The Team Leader, Dr. John Yoder, was selected in September 2001. In February 2002, the team leader and the staff consultant met on campus with the representatives of the University of Redlands to make final determinations about the interview schedule, the template for the visit and any remaining organizational details. Additional consultations took place during the remaining time before the visit.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. These responses were developed in reference to all programs and for the institution as a whole. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using the California Program Standards for all programs.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the institutional contact person, the Faculty and the staff consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of thirteen consisting of a Team Leader, a Common Standards Cluster of two members; a Basic Credential Cluster of three members; a Specialist Credential Cluster of two members; and a Services Credential Cluster of four members. The team added an additional person to focus on the reading study. The institutional contact person and the consultant assigned each credential program to one of the program clusters. The staff consultant then selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and trained in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*.

Each member of the Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the institution's responses to the Common Standards but also considered the Program Standards for each credential area. Members of the Basic and Specialist and Services Clusters primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered Common Standards issues.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday, April 21. The team arrived on Sunday afternoon with a meeting of the entire team followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a reception on Sunday evening to provide an opportunity for Accreditation team members to meet faculty and staff of the institution.

On Monday and Tuesday April 22 and 23, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*.

Planning of the interview schedule was a very complex task. A total of 353 group and individual interviews were conducted by the team members in the two days devoted to collection of data. Each team member made interview contact with approximately 35 interviewees in that time. There was extensive consultation among the members of all clusters, and much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and shared information about findings. Tuesday evening was set aside for an additional team meeting and the writing of the team report. During those work sessions, cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met," "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns or "Standard Not Met." The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard. The team determined that several Common Standards were less than fully met and seven of the Program Standards were less than fully met.

For each separate program area, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards that pointed out any standards that were less than fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team followed two decision tracks: one track for the 2042 teacher preparation program and a regular track for all other programs. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to the

program areas. Across all programs, two program standards were not met, five program standards were less than fully met and six common standards were less than fully met.

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Recommendations by the Team

The team discussed an initial draft of the report on Tuesday evening and made a tentative accreditation decision. After the report was finished, the entire team met Wednesday morning for a final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit.

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Framework*. In its deliberations, the team decided that although 14 program standards were less than fully met, the overall quality of the programs was good. The team did list some concerns, but did not feel that the concerns were of sufficient magnitude such that any additional standards were less than fully met. The team then considered the appropriate accreditation decision for the institution. The options were: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" Probationary Accreditation, or "Denial of Accreditation." After thorough discussion, the entire team voted to recommend the status of "**Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations.**" The recommendation was based on the unanimous agreement of the team.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION - ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

Institution: University of Redlands

Dates of Visit: April 21 – 24, 2002

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS

The accreditation team unanimously supports the above accreditation recommendation based on a careful analysis of all available data presented in the institution's self study reports, documentation available at the time of the visit, and interviews with a wide variety of constituents. Following are the specific stipulations:

- The institution must provide a well defined written plan for hiring and retaining faculty that reflect cultural, ethnic and gender diversity. The plan must indicate how the various levels (President, Academic Vice President, School of Education Dean, etc.) of the university will be involved.
- The institution must provide evidence that it has developed and implemented a systematic, comprehensive and formalized plan for evaluating the quality of its courses and field experiences. The plan must involve diverse community members (e.g., program participants, graduates, local practitioners, participating schools and school districts) in the collection of evaluative information and data and indicate how the information is being used for program design, development and improvement.
- The institution must provide evidence that it develops and implements an individual plan for the mentoring support and professional development of each intern in the Basic Credential program in consultation with the intern and the employing school district.
- The institution must provide evidence that the Multiple Subject coursework begins to prepare each candidate to plan and deliver content-specific instruction in mathematics, science, history-social science, the visual and performing arts, physical education, and health. The coursework as described in the proposed syllabi must include instruction and class experiences addressing specific pedagogical content knowledge.
- The institution must provide evidence that Multiple and Single Subject candidates learn to evaluate current educational technologies and materials, to appropriately select software, to effectively assess electronic research tools including web sites, and to analyze best practices and research findings on the use of technology.

The team recommends that the University of Redlands provide written evidence to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing staff that appropriate actions have been taken to remove each of these stipulations and address all standards that are less than fully met and that the team leader and a team member revisit the university to verify the appropriate action in relation to all stipulations and standards less than fully met within one year from the date of this action.

Rationale:

The recommendation of the accreditation team for ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS was based on a thorough review of the self study documentation presented to the team, additional information in the form of exhibits, extensive interviews with campus and field-based personnel, and additional information requested from administrators during the visit. The team felt it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the institution's operation of its professional preparation programs. Although there are some program standards met minimally and there are concerns expressed by the team, the overall quality of the programs is good. The recommendation of the team was based on the following:

Common Standards:

Four common standards were judged to have been met, three were judged to have been minimally met and one was judged to have been not met.

Data from the students, graduates and employers indicated that, overall, students recommended for credentials were prepared to function appropriately in classrooms, service and administrative positions. Many students and graduates were complimentary about the supportive, personal interest evidenced by the faculty, administration and staff of the School of Education.

However the team identified some specific areas of concern related to some of the standards. Standards two, five, seven and eight were judged to have been met. Standards one, three and six were judged to have been partially met and standard four was judged to be not met.

Program Standards.

While many of the Program Standards were met, ten standards were met with concerns and two were not met in Multiple Subject, and one standard in Single Subjects was not met. The areas of concern are detailed below.

Multiple Subject: For Program Standard 2, the institution has very good informal partnerships. While not currently operational, formal partnerships are in the process of being established. In Program Standard 7A, elements (c) independent reading, (d) spelling instruction, and (j) a plan to implement collaborative relationships are not yet in place. Elements (a) and (b) of Program Standard 8 were met with concern due to a lack of evidence in the instructional portion of the syllabus. For elements (c), (d), (e), and (f) of Program Standard 8, no evidence was found to indicate that candidates would be instructed in the content or instructional strategies for history-social science, visual and performing arts, physical education, and health. Program Standard 9, using technology in the classroom, was not met because no evidence was found that the candidates: (b) analyze best practices and research; (f) use established criteria to evaluate materials; (g) choose appropriate software; or (h) adequately assess electronic resources. For Program Standard 14, evidence was not found to indicate that candidates: (b) learn relevant state and federal laws pertaining to education of exceptional populations, or (d) learn to select assistive technologies or to develop teaching strategies for multiple and diverse special populations. Referring to Program Standard 16, early field work experiences need to be well defined so that roles, responsibilities, and expectations can be communicated to stakeholders. With regard to

Program Standard 18, no evidence was found that candidates in the Multiple Subject program are instructed in subject-specific pedagogical skills in the Teacher Performance Expectations 1A for history-social science, visual and performing arts, physical education, and health.

Single Subject: For Program Standard 2, informal partnerships are substantial. While not currently operational, formal partnerships will be established. In Program Standard 7B, elements (c) (i) no evidence of instruction on making inferences was found and (g) a plan to implement collaborative relationships are not yet in place. Program Standard 9, using technology in the classroom, was not met because no evidence was found that the candidates: (b) analyze best practices and research; (f) use established criteria to evaluate materials; (g) choose appropriate software; or (h) adequately assess electronic resources. For Program Standard 14, evidence was not found to indicate that candidates: (b) learn relevant state and federal laws pertaining to education of exceptional populations, or (d) learn to select assistive technologies or to develop teaching strategies for multiple and diverse special populations. Referring to Program Standard 16, early field work experiences need to be well defined so that roles, responsibilities, and expectations can be communicated to stakeholders.

Clinical Rehabilitative Services:

The team determined that for the Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential Program, all ASHA and supplementary CTC standards and preconditions were met, although ASHA standard 5.2 was met minimally. All standards and preconditions for the Special Class Authorization are met.

All standards were met for the preliminary, professional and preliminary internship credentials and for the Pupil Personnel Services, School Counseling Credential Programs.

Team Leader: **John Yoder**
Fresno Pacific University

Common Standards Cluster:
Louise Adler, Cluster Leader
California State University, Fullerton
J. Alex Pulido
California State University, Los Angeles

Basic Credential Program Cluster:
Virginia Glenn, Cluster Leader
Lake Tahoe Unified School District
Christine G. Renne
California State University, Fullerton
Katherine Liu
Jefferson Union High School District

Services Credential Program Cluster:
Gene Gallegos, Cluster Leader
California State University, Bakersfield
Cynthia DeClercq
Poway Unified School District
Louis H. Shaup
Pasadena Unified School District
Terry Saenz
California State University, Fullerton
Albert Valencia
California State University, Fresno

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog
 Institutional Self Study
 Course Syllabi
 Candidate Files
 Fieldwork Handbooks
 Follow-up Survey Results
 Needs Analysis Results
 Information Booklets
 Field Experience Notebooks
 Schedule of Classes
 Advisement Documents
 Faculty Vitae

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Common Stand. Cluster	Basic Cred. Cluster	Services Cred. Cluster	TOTAL
Program Faculty	14	18	31	63
Institutional Administration	8	1	3	12
Candidates	25	39	70	134
Graduates	0	9	24	33
Employers of Graduates	2	3	17	22
Supervising Practitioners	1	10	17	28
Advisors	0	18	10	28
School Administrators	5	2	13	20
Credential Analyst	1	1	1	3
Advisory Committee	0	0	1	1

TOTAL 353

Common Standards

Standard 1 Educational Leadership

Standard Met Minimally With Qualitative Concerns

The School of Education has a clear statement of their mission that fosters a student-centered approach to learning, rigorous academic preparation, and developing bridges between theory and practice. Also identified as important is that “work as reflective educators is grounded in the quest for social justice.” The University Council for Education Preparation Programs was formed in the fall of 2001, which is used to review and/or initiate policy to improve teacher education programs and promote College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Education collaboration in research and service to local schools.

The formation of the School of Education was approved by the Board of Trustees in the spring of 2000. A new Dean for the school was employed in the summer of 2001. The next major change was the move of the School of Education to a newly renovated building in University Hall. The work of the education unit has been re-organized with programs headed by Program Directors and the employment of Directors of Field Experiences and Administration of Enrollment Services.

The mission statement of the university and the School of Education includes several statements that focus on issues of pluralism and diversity: “This effectiveness will be demonstrated through our graduate’s success in teaching the diverse population of students in their schools...;” “...We seek to develop reflective educators who understand the complex and changing nature of educational practice in a pluralistic cultural context;” “Our work...is grounded in the quest for social justice....” A lack of on-going efforts based on a plan to assure a faculty that reflects diverse cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity suggests a need for focused leadership of this effort. Leadership is now required to move beyond these statements to embedding across the education programs plans to assure that faculty reflect and are knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity as outlined in the Common Standards for all credential programs. The plans must include objectives, time lines and benchmarks by which a determination of progress can be made

Strengths:

In April 20, 2000, the University arranged for the preparation of a Feasibility Study and Analysis for the Establishment of a School of Education. Prior to that a report titled, School of Education Concept and Planning Considerations was drafted. The Feasibility Study made a number of recommendations that have been implemented such as beginning the incorporation of technology into teacher education programs. It appears that the University has made a significant effort to develop a new organizational structure and provide the necessary leadership for the School of Education.

Standard 2-Resources

Data from the institution's self-study and interviews with academic administrators and faculty indicate that the resource needs of the School of Education are being met. The University of Redlands is currently developing a new budgeting model with the assistance of KPMG, which will provide more information about the flow of resources to the School of Education.

Standard Met

The School of Education has added support-staff positions related to admissions and technology. Staff members have also been employed to keep the School of Education office and labs open and operating from 5:00pm to 10:00pm. In addition, the School is currently searching for seven new faculty members. The new building provides very appropriate settings for faculty offices and classrooms. The School of Education currently has 58% of classes taught by adjunct faculty. The goal of the School is to have at least 50% of all courses taught by full-time faculty.

Strengths:

The University has committed significant resources to launching the School of Education and the continued expansion of the full-time faculty. The new building with the new technology access and labs is a significant improvement providing an improved infrastructure for teaching and services to students. Technology training for both faculty and students supported these investments.

Concerns:

The Communicative Disorders program has resource needs regarding aging equipment, safety of a play area, and facility space. Students cannot take their child clients into the area to do play therapy. Another concern is the lack of a clinical planning area with space to store tests and materials and there is no laboratory space for research or teaching purposes.

There is inconsistent delineation of resource support by school districts for internship programs in multiple subjects, single subject, and administrative intern credential programs.

In the School of Education, the relatively small number of tenured and tenure track or full-time faculty means that these faculty members must advise more students than they would normally under circumstances where a greater proportion of the faculty is full-time.

Standard 3-Faculty

Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns

The University of Redlands has standards for the employment and evaluation of faculty. All full-time faculty and all but one of the clinical faculty have doctoral degrees. Students evaluate each course and these evaluations, are used in the evaluation of both full-time and part-time faculty. The team found evidence of part-time faculty appointments being contingent upon sound course evaluations by students was found. Faculty and administrators spoke about the value and importance of the faculty reflecting cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity. Faculty noted that support is provided to assist them in developing their teaching and research agendas.

There is a perception among some faculty that there is a lack of support for faculty of color. It was also noted by a faculty member that there have been more openings at other universities for education faculty and that the eleven-month teaching assignment with many night courses might cause faculty to leave the University of Redlands. Still, institutional administrators reported that over the last several years at least three faculty of color have left the University. Within this context, inquiries were made regarding the University plans to have a faculty that reflects cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity. Evidence of the institution having a plan prior to the visit was not available, nor was evidence available as to how such a plan would be implemented to recruit and retain faculty of color. Both recruitment and retention need to be addressed in order to have a faculty that reflects diversity.

Strengths

Faculty expressed appreciation for grant funding to support research and for other faculty development and travel support. Faculty also mentioned the availability of in-service training opportunities. Some faculty are especially knowledgeable about diversity issues.

Concerns

The institution provided some evidence of a plan to use other data beyond just the end of course evaluations provided by students for evaluation of part-time faculty. This plan has not been implemented in any significant manner.

Standard 4-Evaluation

Standard Not Met

Both in interviews with faculty, academic administrators, and employers it became obvious that the institution has not been doing systemic, formal program evaluation. In many cases, including the self study, discussions about how students are evaluated were presented in response to standards and questions about program evaluation. The team was not able to find common patterns across credential programs for program evaluation. Most importantly evidence, was not obtained that shows how data collected in follow-up studies recently conducted are used to revise, up-date, and improve credential programs offered by the University of Redlands. There has been no systemic collection of data from local practitioners other than individuals employed as adjunct faculty members. The institution does not have a plan that would include the evaluation of internship programs and an indication of how certificated exclusive representatives, if applicable, will be represented.

Strengths

The Communicative Disorders program surveys employers and senior level graduates, interviews masters level graduates, and consults with their advisory committee, which meets once a year. The ongoing results are applied to revision and improvement of the program.

Concerns

Plans for a comprehensive and systemic program evaluation such as the graphic presented in the PowerPoint presentation at the introductory overview does not seem to be operationalized.

Standard 5-Admissions

Standard Met

During the past two years staff, administrators and faculty revamped admission criteria and procedures which were previously under the umbrella of Whitehead College. Student interviews indicated that admission procedures were clearly outlined and that staff was very helpful in assisting with the total process.

The School of Education utilizes various approaches to recruit students including Career and Teacher Fairs, mailings to school districts, businesses and other target populations in order to attract candidates into educational careers.

Strengths

The admission process has been improved and students and faculty have indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the new criteria and procedures used for admission.

There is both faculty and staff support during the admissions process, including one-on-one counseling.

Linguistic and cultural diversity of applicants are considered to be positive factors in the admissions process for students in the Communicative Disorders program.

Concerns

Admission criteria are available within each department and the School of Education; however, students indicated that they were confused between the requirements for the University, School of Education and individual departments.

Faculty indicated that advisement could be improved if they had access to the student's historical and academic data on their computers. However, the process of computerizing student records is currently in the beginning stages.

There does not appear to be a systemic process to recruit students, especially minorities, into School of Education programs. A plan to recruit minority students was referenced in documents provided during the visit; however, the plan was not made available.

Standard 6-Advice and Assistance**Met Minimally
with Quantitative Concerns**

The general response from students was that the faculty and staff are very supportive and that School of Education personnel convey a strong sense of dedication and commitment toward meeting their needs. Small classes, personal student contacts, and friendly staff and faculty have been mentioned as strong factors.

Program candidates are assigned faculty advisors in the credential programs. Enrollment Counselors meet with each prospective applicant to discuss the requirements of application and admission. After students are enrolled, the requirements for the different credential programs are covered in subject orientations. Students have indicated that the assistance provided in the admission process has been very helpful.

An institutional administrator reported that, for the multiple subject and single subject intern credential programs, the university does not provide professional development and mentoring plans for interns, unless students have difficulty in their programs. The result is that most interns do not have plans in these intern credential programs. The University was not able to provide copies of plans that were developed as the internships begin. Files of individual interns were also reviewed for evidence of the plans. None were observed. The institution was not able to supply evidence that Basic Credential interns receive support from one or more certificated person(s) who are assigned at the same school, who are experienced in the curricular area(s) of the interns assignment, trained in support techniques, oriented to the support role and appropriately evaluated, recognized and rewarded by the institution and/or school district. In addition, there is no mentoring/professional development plan for the interns in the Basic credential.

Strengths

The School of Education staff and faculty meet with each applicant and assist them with the admissions process. In addition, they keep good records of applicants.

In the Communicative Disorders program, students meet twice each semester with their faculty advisor. At the beginning of the program, they are required to write a short essay and are referred for writing assistance if needed. If they have difficulty in meeting clinical standards, they are placed on a clinical contract and given additional support by faculty.

Standard 7-School Collaboration

Standard Met

The School of Education maintains partnerships with many surrounding county and local school districts and those administrators, teachers and supporting staff interviewed indicate positive relationships with university personnel. Different types of partnerships have been identified including field experiences, administrator and teacher internships, student teacher placements and other contractual agreements.

Students participate in field experiences at various schools in surrounding communities including internships for the teaching and administrative services credential programs. Supervision is provided by district personnel for candidates in these programs. Feedback provided by district representatives indicates that communication and collaboration between both systems is adequate.

Strengths

Collaboration between the local schools and the university is a strong point. There is an informal network of supportive adjunct faculty and supervisory staff that help to facilitate collaboration.

For the Basic credential, The University creates a list of qualified candidates that is circulated among districts that wish to hire interns.

The Personnel Pupil Services and Administrative Credential programs use contracts and have ongoing conversations between University personnel and school-site supervisors in the schools during the field work experience.

Concerns

Even though the informal connection is strong, there is a lack of a formal structure for collaboration with school districts for the Basic credential. In addition, there is a lack of collaboration in the selection of intern mentors and supervisors.

Standard 8-Field Supervision**Standard Met**

Faculty and institutional administrators expressed strong support for the importance of field experiences in the training of credential candidates. Supervisors interviewed showed dedication to their work with candidates. The process of formalizing processes and standards within the School of Education will enhance efforts related to field supervision of candidates. It appears that this process is in the beginning stages. The team reviewed fieldwork handbooks for all of the programs except the Preliminary Administrative services. This program has several packets which they currently use as students are inducted into the program. They have plans to develop a fieldwork handbook.

Strengths

A “Handbook for Student Teachers, Master Teachers, and University Supervisors” has been developed.

The university has a strong training process for master teachers who participate. In addition, there are evaluation procedures for master teachers in the Clinical Rehabilitative Services, and Special Class Authorization credential programs.

Concerns

Even though the university has a strong training process for master teachers, there is inconsistent participation among the master teachers. Evidence of a systemic evaluation of all master teachers in the basic credentials was also not available.

Multiple Subject Credential Program

The University chose to become “early adopters” of the 2042 Program Standards and wrote their institutional self study to those standards. However, the program described in this document is not yet in place. In the course of the team’s review, the team learned about the programs and procedures currently in place, and the planned programs for the future. With this information, the team made inferences as to the potential effectiveness of the new program in meeting the Program Standards. In the elements of several of these standards, reference is made to the Teacher Performance Assessments (TPAs) which are yet to be finalized by the State. The University has addressed these TPAs to the best of their ability at this time and will need to re-visit this area in the future.

Findings on Standards

Of special note were students' comments on the value of their diversity preparation. Most stated that they were well prepared to meet the needs of the diverse student populations in their classrooms. Students also noted the warm, friendly atmosphere created by the staff and faculty members. They felt supported by both the School of Education and fellow students in the program. Equally important, the extensive informal network of alums and long-term associates of the University of Redlands provided valuable contacts and resources were readily available.

After reviewing the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of active candidates, completers, full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, supervisors and employers, the team determined that twelve Program Standards are met. Program Standards 2, 7A, 14, 16, and 18 are met with concerns. Program Standards 8 and 9 are not met.

Program Standard 2

Met with Concerns

Elements (e) and (f)

While formal partnerships were not in place for the development of this program, the Dean has indicated a commitment to:

1. Establish an Advisory Board consisting of local district educators, business people, and other community representatives;
2. Draft formal school partnership MOUs that specify the activities, resources, and respective responsibilities of the School and local districts;
3. Arrange regular meetings between school district personnel (e.g. Human Resource personnel and building administrators) to meet with School faculty to discuss how candidates are doing and what the School might do to improve programs; and
4. Collaborate more formally and frequently regarding School/District partnerships.

Program Standard 7A (Reading)

Met with Concerns

Element (c) i: The team found no evidence of instruction on strategies that promote and guide pupil independent reading.

Element (d): The team reviewed documents and was unable to discover evidence of spelling instruction.

Element (j): The team found that a plan is described in the self-study to develop and implement the collaborative relationships, but that the plan is not yet in place.

Program Standard 8

Not Met

Elements (a) and (b)

Although the School documented the learning of the academic content standards and teaching of mathematics across the curriculum, this Team did not find evidence in the documentation that candidates would learn the interrelated components of a balanced program of mathematics instruction. The same was true of the science. While several examples are included in the self-study, they are not part of the syllabus.

Elements (c), (d), (e), and (f)

Although the School documented the learning of the academic content standards and have history-social science, visual and performing arts, physical education and health as part of an integrated curriculum, no evidence was found to indicate instruction in how to teach these content areas.

Program Standard 9

Not Met

Elements (b), (f), (g), (h)

Documentation and interviews showed that technological resources are pre-selected by a librarian or course instructor from which candidates select materials. We did not find evidence that candidates:

- (b) analyze best practices and research findings on the use of technology and designed lessons accordingly.
- (f) examine a variety of current educational technologies and use established selection criteria to evaluate materials;
- (g) choose software for its relevance, effectiveness, alignment with content standards, and value added to student learning;
- (h) demonstrate competency in the use of electronic research tools and the ability to assess the authenticity, reliability, and bias of the data gathered.

Program Standard 14

Met with Concerns

Element (b)

Evidence was not found to indicate that candidates learned relevant state and federal laws pertaining to the education of exceptional populations.

Element (d)

Evidence was not found to indicate that candidates learn to select assistive technologies. While candidates develop teaching strategies for special population students in their own student teaching or intern classrooms, no evidence was found that candidates learn or develop teaching strategies for other multiple and diverse special populations.

Program Standard 16**Met with Concerns**

Element (g)

Referring to program standard 16, early field work experiences need to be well defined so that roles, responsibilities, and expectations can be communicated to stakeholders

Program Standard 18**Met with Concerns**

Element (b)

The team found no evidence that candidates in the Multiple Subject program are instructed in subject-specific pedagogical skills in the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) 1A for math, science, history-social science, the arts, physical education and health.

Single Subjects Credential Program

The University chose to become “early adopters” of the 2042 Program Standards and wrote their institutional self study to those standards. However, the program described in this document is not yet in place. In the course of our review, we learned about the programs and procedures currently in place and the planned programs for the future. With this information, we made inferences as to the potential effectiveness of the new program in meeting the Program Standards. In the elements of several of these standards, reference is made to the Teacher Performance Assessments (TPAs) which are yet to be finalized by the State. The University has addressed these TPAs to the best of their ability at this time and will need to re-visit this area in the future.

Findings on Standards

Of special note were students' comments on the value of their diversity preparation. Most stated that they were well prepared to meet the needs of the diverse student populations in their classrooms. Students also noted the warm, friendly atmosphere created by the staff and faculty members. They felt supported by both the School of Education and fellow students in the program. Equally important, the extensive informal network of alums and long-term associates of the University of Redlands provided valuable contacts and resources were readily available.

After reviewing the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of active candidates, completers, full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, supervisors and employers, the team determined that twelve Program Standards are met. Program Standards 2, 7B, 14, and 16 are met with concerns. Program Standards 9 is not met.

Program Standard 2

Met with Concerns

Elements (e) and (f)

While formal partnerships were not in place for the development of this program, the Dean has indicated a commitment to:

- Establish an Advisory Board consisting of local district educators, business people, and other community representatives;
- Draft formal school partnership MOUs that specify the activities, resources, and respective responsibilities of the School and local districts;
- Arrange regular meetings between school district personnel (e.g. Human Resource personnel and building administrators) to meet with School faculty to discuss how candidates are doing and what the School might do to improve programs; and
- Collaborate more formally and frequently regarding School/District partnerships.

Program Standard 7B (Reading)**Met with Concerns**

Element c (i): The team found no evidence of instruction about making inferences.

Element g: The team found that a plan is described in the self study to develop and implement the collaborative relationships, but that the plan is not yet in place.

Program Standard 9**Not Met**

Elements (b), (f), (g), (h)

Documentation and interviews showed that candidates selected from technological resources pre-selected by librarian or course instructor. We did not find evidence that candidates:

- (b) analyze best practices and research findings on the use of technology and designed lessons accordingly.
- (f) examine a variety of current educational technologies and use established selection criteria to evaluate materials;
- (g) choose software for its relevance, effectiveness, alignment with content standards, and value added to student learning;
- (h.) demonstrate competency in the use of electronic research tools and the ability to assess the authenticity, reliability, and bias of the data gathered.

Program Standard 14**Met with Concerns**

Element (b)

Evidence was not found to indicate that candidates learned relevant state and federal laws pertaining to the education of exceptional populations.

Element (d)

Evidence was not found to indicate that candidates learn to select assistive technologies or to develop teaching strategies for multiple and diverse special populations.

Program Standard 16**Met with Concerns**

Element (g)

Referring to program standard 16, early field work experiences need to be well defined so that roles, responsibilities, and expectations can be communicated to stakeholders.

Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential in Language, Speech, and Hearing

Findings on Standards

Based on data gathered from the program report, review of supporting documentation, student files, and interviews with faculty, candidates, graduates, employers, supervisors and advisory committee members, it was determined that all ASHA and supplementary CTC standards and preconditions were met, although ASHA standard 5.2 was met minimally.

Standard 5.2

Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns

The Communicative Disorders program has resource needs that are not being met at this time regarding aging equipment, safety of a play area, and facility space. The most pressing need is replacement of the audio-visual system in the Morrison Clinic. The system is necessary to observe clinical sessions, but equipment breaks down on occasion. Another concern is the unsafe play area paved with asphalt. Students cannot take their child clients into the area to do play therapy. Yet another concern is the lack of a clinical planning area with space to store tests and materials. The program also has no laboratory space for research or teaching purposes.

Strengths

The hallmark of this program is the faculty's close relationship with and accessibility to their students. Faculty members have an "open door" policy, promptly return calls and e-mails, and often invite students into their homes. In return, both undergraduate and graduate students consider faculty their coaches and mentors. Faculty members' dedication is apparent in everything from their meticulous syllabi to their willingness to lend students items from their own stock of therapy materials. Students also report a sense of camaraderie and teamwork with their peers in the program.

The program is very well organized into a logical sequence of academic and clinical experiences. Student advisement is frequent and systematic, and students feel well directed by their advisors. Clinical training is extremely strong, with students developing critical thinking skills and the ability to clinically apply coursework and readings.

Graduate students and graduates have an excellent reputation in the community. The Communicative Disorders program is also highly regarded.

Concerns

A small asphalt play area containing outmoded play equipment is unsafe for child clients' play and currently cannot be used. In addition, students lack a clinical preparation room that would enable them to store all of the clinic's materials in one area, have access to computers with printers, and prepare for therapy sessions in the clinic. At the present time, students use the library in the Truesdail Center for clinical preparation, and materials are stored in several different locations in the building. The creation of laboratory space is also a priority because laboratory equipment is currently stored on tables in one of the classrooms.

Special Class Authorization

Findings on Standards

All standards and preconditions for the Special Class Authorization are met. The combination of coursework and clinical and teaching experiences trains students well for the role of teacher in a Communicatively Handicapped Classroom. Both students and master teachers report that students are well prepared for their roles of student teacher and, later, Communicatively Handicapped classroom teacher.

Strengths

Students are taught a variety of innovative pedagogical methods to apply to classroom teaching. Instruction in literacy and language arts are particular strengths. They are additionally given clinical experience in working with children with learning disabilities on academic skills before they do their student teaching.

Concerns

None noted.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

Findings on Standards

After reviewing the institutional report and supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and field supervisors, the team determines that the Preliminary Administrative Credential and the Preliminary Administrative Credential with Internship Programs meet all the applicable standards.

The goal of the program is to prepare and provide professional level learning experiences for educational leaders seeking to certify their skills as educational administrators in the K-12 environment. The curriculum fosters a blend of theory and practice with candidates encouraged to link their course activities and fieldwork experiences to their assignment at their school site. The program foundation is based on Instructional Leadership with an emphasis on data based decision-making resulting in expectation of success for all students.

Strengths:

All constituents report that the goals and objectives of the Preliminary Credential Program and the Preliminary Credential Program with Internship are clearly articulated and supported with written documentation. The regular and adjunct faculty members are regarded by the candidates as knowledgeable and appropriately assigned to courses based on background and prior experiences. Candidates report that program faculty are dedicated to enhancing the quality of educational experiences of students and that faculty members demonstrate professional competencies together with the passion of committed educators. Candidates reported that the institution has an effective and efficient system designed to guide, assist and evaluate their progress through the programs. Employers regard the institution's program highly and actively seek out graduates and interns to employ in their school districts. The program's emphasis on using data to make decisions regarding curriculum and instruction has especially proven to be practical for completers of the program as they do their daily tasks as teachers, prospective administrators and administrative interns. It is acknowledged by all persons interviewed that the faculty aligns all courses in the program directly to CCTC Standards for administrators.

Concern:

It is a concern that the process for school and professional community collaborations has not been formalized. This does not mean collaboration does not occur, but evidence of a systemic process was not available in the documentation.

Professional Administrative Services Credential

Findings on Standards

After the review of the institutional report and supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty members, employers and field supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Professional Administrative Services Credential with the exception of standard 7, Mentoring Qualifications. There is no written set of criteria or written process for selecting and assessing qualifications of mentors. Neither students nor mentors are able to articulate the roles and responsibilities of the mentors. The goal of this program is the same as for the Preliminary

Administrative Program and the Preliminary Administrative Credential with Internship, which is the blending of theory and practice. The curriculum has been revised to reflect changing demands on site administrators such as State mandated testing, standards-based curriculum, data-driven decision-making, increasing campus violence, national safety concerns and the increasing diversity in schools. Non-university activities are blended into the induction plan in a seamless manner.

Strengths

Individual Induction Plans are developed with highly personalized input from candidates, their supervisors, and institutional faculty to meet continuing educational goals, which address leadership needs at their current school sites. Candidates report faculty members are highly knowledgeable, accessible and cite them as tremendous assets to the program in terms of guidance and mentorship. The program features a balance in curriculum content in the five thematic areas required by the State standards. Candidates note the “currency” of the curriculum as strength of the program. Those who have completed their Professional Administrative Credential Program report that course requirements were highly applicable to their daily activities as school administrators. Candidates also report that the teaching of how to apply data to make decisions regarding curriculum and instruction has proven to be practical and meaningful preparation for them in their daily work.

Technology is infused within the curriculum including the fieldwork practicums. Employers say candidates are proficient in using technology tools for productivity and instruction.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Credential Program

Findings on Standards

The Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program with specialization in School Counseling was evaluated according to the standards approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The team finds the program to meet all of the applicable Generic Standards #1-16.

Generic Standards #1-16 have been fully met. Highlights include:

Students and graduates gave high marks to the Interpersonal Relationships (EDUC 601) and Pluralism in Education (EDUC 602) classes during their first semester. Socio-cultural competence is incorporated as a running theme throughout the PPS program (Standard 3). Candidates have access to computer technology through an instructional technology classroom and resources room. All classrooms are wired for access to the new high-speed network. A full-time faculty member has been appointed Director of Educational Technology (Standard 15).

School Counselor Specialization Standards #17-32 have been fully met. Highlights include: Both state and national standards are addressed in each course syllabus as well as being included in the university's Counseling and Field Placement Handbook (Standard 17). As part of the Academic Development course students engage in self-reflective exercises including attending a minimum of 10 weeks of personal and social counseling (Standard 19).

Strengths

The university is to be commended for the academic leadership within the School of Education.

Graduates of the program had high praise for the quality of the instruction. They particularly appreciated that some of their instructors were practicing public school (K-12) counselors.

Graduates of the program were very positive when commenting how well they were prepared for their current position as a school counselor in different settings. Interviews with employers also confirmed the high quality of preparation.

Students appreciated that classes are offered at convenient times that fit their needs.

Program instructors and administrators are readily available to students for advisement and consultation.

Concerns

No formal process in place to seek input from practitioners, school site administrators, and diverse community members in program evaluation and design activities.

Professional Comments

(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)

Multiple and Single Subjects Credential Programs

Teaching Single Subject Content Areas (EDUC 506)

The interdisciplinary nature of the Secondary Methods course provides a rich experience increasing candidate awareness of the challenges of teaching in disciplines other than their own. The addition of subject specific methods and strategies would strengthen this course. For example, science teachers need to know and understand equipment management, laboratory and chemical safety standards and those teaching physical education need to know how to assure the physical safety of students. Art, music, and business all have discipline specific equipment and materials that require special training.

Foundations of Education (EDUC 501)

The idea of introducing concepts in the introductory class and spiraling to a more complex level in future classes is to be commended. However, we feel that with the ambitious intentions for EDUC 501 it will be difficult for students to gain sufficient depth and breadth of understanding of many of the concepts addressed.

Syllabus Structure

Among those presented, the syllabi for EDUC 504 and EDUC 505 are illustrations of ways to address both content and instructional strategies. This material is presented with sufficient detail that an instructor might use this document to provide a challenging, informative course with content applied to classroom situations. Some of the other syllabi lacked this integration of content along with instructional strategies.

Financial Aid Resources

A number of students expressed frustration with respect to the availability of, and access to, financial aid information. Some also felt that information received was inconsistent.

Evaluation of Adjunct Faculty

Student evaluation at the end of each course appears to be the primary means of evaluating adjunct faculty. In our judgement, both students and adjunct would benefit from additional professional input to this process.

Consistent Terminology

Terms need to be defined and used consistently. Among those that we have observed as inconsistent and interchangeable include "intern" and "student-teacher", and "teacher work sample", "professional portfolio", and "electronic portfolio".

All criteria for admission need to be placed in a School of Education Handbook.

Professional Resumes

Some resumes and curriculum vitae included in the Self-Study were out of date or absent.

Administrative Services Credential Programs

- Program faculty might consider using two mentors for Professional Credential candidates. One mentor would be the academic mentor and the other mentor would handle the fieldwork projects and day-to-day functions of the mentoring process.
- Adjunct faculty members could be made to feel more a “part of the team” by having the program faculty schedule periodic articulation meetings for the purpose of sharing ideas, issues and concerns, as well as just getting to know each other better.
- The evaluation component for adjunct faculty could be enhanced by expanding the evaluation process beyond the student evaluation of instructors at the end of each course. Actual classroom observations by the Program Director or other program faculty would be informative and valuable for the development of adjuncts.
- There were mixed reviews on the use of Blackboard from staff and candidates. Additional staff development for student and staff on Blackboard is suggested.

Clinical Rehabilitation

The program follows an infusion model to teach cultural diversity issues. However, students would welcome a regular intersession course on cultural diversity. Several of the faculty have experience and expertise in issues of cultural diversity and would be able to teach such a course. In this highly culturally diverse area, it is also recommended that the program actively seek to add a culturally diverse tenure track faculty member and to increase the number of culturally diverse students. Last but not least, the training experience of bilingual students can also be enhanced by placement with bilingual master teachers who could serve as models and mentors.

More infusion of augmentative/alternative communication into the curriculum is recommended.

The program is in the process of changing its curriculum. It would be helpful to solicit student input in terms of curriculum changes.

Special Class Authorization

Students report that they are well prepared for teaching; however, it is recommended that additional information on mathematics be infused into the existing coursework.